

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September, by Loyola University Press, 3441 North Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.
Rev. James A. Kleist, S. J., Editor. Subscription price: One Dollar a Year.

Entered as second class matter December 14, 1927, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. VII

MARCH, 1931

No. 6

Papyrus as Writing Material, I

The ancients used a great variety of materials to record writing. Palm leaves were used in India, lime bark in Rome. Linen cloth was used in Egypt and in Rome; clay and pottery were in use both in the East and the West. Wooden tablets inscribed with writing have been found in Egypt, Greece and Italy. Waxed tablets were known in Greece, Rome, France, England, and Ireland. St. Augustine possessed ivory tablets for correspondence,¹ and Propertius mentions ivory tablets encased in gold.² Eventually, all these materials, except the last-mentioned, were replaced by the cheaper and more convenient papyrus, until this in turn was superseded by the vellum codex in the fourth century.

Fragile as papyrus is,³ the dry climate of Egypt has preserved thousands of specimens, many of which are almost as fresh now as on the day they were written. The first discovery of papyri was made in 1752 at Herculaneum, where a number of charred rolls were found. The first volume of facsimile texts appeared in Naples in 1793. The earliest discovery of papyri in Egypt was made in 1778 at Fayum, where 40 or 50 rolls came to light. These rolls are said to have been burned up by the natives for their aromatic odor, but experiment has not succeeded in confirming the supposed purpose. The single specimen which escaped this fate was published at Rome in 1778 under the auspices of Cardinal Stefano Borgia.⁴ Discoveries of papyri have continued from that time on, but the bulk of the papyri now preserved in the great libraries dates from the vast find made at Arsinoë in the Fayum in 1877, the larger part of which went to the collection of Archduke Rainer in Vienna. Although most of the papyri since discovered have found their way into private collections, the Egyptian Exploration Society has provided for a distribution every ten years, so that specimens are now available in the libraries and museums of our larger cities. Papyri are found chiefly in the "afsh" of rubbish heaps, the cartonnages of mummy cases, crocodile fillings, and the debris of buildings.

Since the papyrus plant grew chiefly in the Nile delta, Egypt naturally became the center of the papyrus industry. According to Theophrastus,⁵ the plant grew also in Syria, and Pliny tells us⁶ that it was native to the Niger and the Euphrates. Theophrastus and Pliny describe it as growing in the shallows of the Nile to a height of six feet, with a tapering triangular stem, which is crowned with a tufted head. The root, as thick as a man's wrist, strikes out at right angles to the stem,

and from it smaller roots push down into the mud. The tufted heads of the plant were wreathed into garlands for the temples; various utensils were made of the root, while the stem was used for caulking yarn, ships' rigging, light skiffs, sandals, etc. The pith served for food, but was chiefly used to manufacture writing material.

The earliest use of papyrus as writing material is unknown, but the oldest specimens still extant take us far back into the history of Egypt. Papyrus was in common use as writing material thirty-five centuries B. C., and was used to record literary works not more than ten centuries later. The most ancient papyrus known contains accounts from the reign of King Asa, 3500 B. C. (Petrie, Thompson), and the papyrus Prisse in Paris records a literary work of 2500 B. C. Papyrus rolls sculptured on the walls of ancient temples also prove the antiquity of this writing material.

Papyrus was used in many countries. Herodotus says⁷ that in his time the Greeks termed papyrus rolls *διφθέρα*, a statement which shows at least that papyrus was in common use among the Greeks in Asia Minor in the fifth century B. C. The Assyrians termed the papyrus "the reed of Egypt." Two Assyrian wall sculptures in the British Museum represent two pairs of scribes, one scribe of each pair holding a roll in his hand. These rolls may be either papyrus or leather.⁸ As early as the eleventh century B. C., papyrus was exported in large quantities from Egypt into Phoenicia.⁹ Papyrus was used for the fair copy of the accounts when the Erechtheum was rebuilt in Athens, 407 B. C.¹⁰ The inscription recording this fact incidentally tells us that the price of papyrus was one drachma and two obols per roll, and that the price of the wooden tablets, on which the rough copy of these accounts had been made, was two drachmas each. But we know nothing of the comparative amount of writing space provided on these two units of material.

In Italy papyrus was probably used from the beginning. It was so common a necessity during the Empire that, as Pliny¹¹ tells us, a papyrus famine in the reign of Tiberius threatened to disturb the transaction of business. It was probably imported in a manufactured state, but the *charta Fanniana* was produced in Rome. It is claimed, however, that this was a manufacture of Egyptian products, in the process of which a *scheda* of *charta Augusta* was used for the *recto*, and one of *charta Livia* for the *verso*. The brittle character of the papyri found at Herculaneum perhaps lends color to this view.¹²

Pliny¹³ is the chief source of information about the process by which papyrus was manufactured into writing material in Egypt. But the obscurity of his style and the corruption of the text render his meaning in some instances doubtful. The rind was removed from the stem of the plant, and the cellular pith cut lengthwise into thin strips (*philyrae, scissurae*) with an *acus*. The widest, and therefore most desirable, strips were those cut from the largest diameter of the stem. The strips were laid side by side vertically on a board to form a layer (*scheda*) as wide as the sheet desired. Then another layer of strips was laid horizontally across them to form what Pliny terms a *plagula* or *crates*. The two layers were firmly attached to each other by a paste made of Nile water and some adhesive material. This means perhaps that the Nile water merely solved glutinous matter in the pith, and so caused the two layers to form a compact mass. The side on which the strips lay horizontally was the only side of the finished sheet intended to receive writing. To prepare it for this purpose the two layers were hammered with a mallet, so as to make them adhere to each other evenly and continuously¹⁴ and to remove any moisture that might have remained between them. So prepared, the material was dried in the sun, and any rough or uneven spots that still remained were smoothed¹⁵ with an animal's tooth or with a shell.¹⁶ Martial alludes to the latter when he writes¹⁷

Levis ab aequorea cortex Mareotica concha
Fiat, inoffensa currit harundo via.

It seems that, in Ulpian's time at least,¹⁸ rolls intended for the market were hammered again after they had been inscribed, to make their surface perfectly even.

For literary purposes and, in general, when a considerable length of papyrus was desired, the finished sheets were made up into rolls by pasting them together side by side. The artisan that did this work was called *κολλητής* or *glutinator*;¹⁹ the sheets as parts of the roll were called *κολλήματα*, *plagulae, schedae*. The standard length of papyrus sold by stationers was called a *scapus*, which, according to the current interpretation of Pliny's text, consisted of twenty sheets. As a matter of fact, no extant papyrus has exactly this length. Judging from the specimens that survive, the usual length of a roll was from twenty to thirty feet.²⁰ Indirect evidence as to the length of papyrus rolls is implied in Martial's statement that a *liber* could contain about three hundred of his epigrams, and that a *librarius* might copy about one hundred of them in an hour.²¹ The true meaning of Pliny, therefore, seems to be that the stationers' standard length of papyrus consisted of twenty *κολλήματα*, and that the user added to the roll, or cut away from it, according to his needs.

In joining the sheets together into a roll, the best were placed at the outer end, because this part of the roll was most exposed to wear and tear. The outermost sheet was called *πρωτόκολλον*; the last, or innermost, was termed the *ἐσχατοκόλιον*.²² To give additional strength to the material, a protecting strip of papyrus was often

pasted across the margin of the end of the roll. Among the Romans, the *πρωτόκολλον* was inscribed with the name of the Imperial Treasurer (*comes largitionum*), who controlled the manufacture of papyrus. In legal documents, these certifications had to be left intact on the roll,²³ but were usually cut off when the roll served for private use.

The height of papyrus rolls varied considerably. In the earlier period of Egyptian history, it was about six inches, later about nine to eleven inches. Larger rolls, chiefly tax registers, are fifteen or more inches high.²⁴

(To be continued)

Columbus, Ohio

DR. LEO F. MILLER

FOOTNOTES

1. *Ep.*, 15 (CV 35, 16).
2. III, 23. Cf. Martial, XIV, 5.
3. The dictionaries steer clear of any attempt to derive the word *πάπυρος*. My orientalist colleague, Dr. Molitor, informs me that in the bohairic dialect *pa* signifies *that of*; *pi* is the masculine article; and *ior* means *the river*, that is, *the Nile*. *Pa-pi-ior*, therefore, signifies *that of the Nile*, in Greek, *ὁ τοῦ ποταμοῦ*, sc. "the Nile reed." *Βύβλος* (and later *βίβλος*), which was another name for papyrus, also has an interesting sematology. See Herder's *Konversations-Lexicon*.
4. Milne in Grenfell, Hunt, Hogarth, *Fayum Towns and their Papyri*, p. 17; Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the New Testament*, p. ix. For *afsh*, mentioned below, cf. Milne, p. 24 f.
5. *Hist. Plant.*, v, 10.
6. *Nat. Hist.*, xiii, 11.
7. *Hist.*, v, 88.
8. Thompson, *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, p. 22, note 1.
9. *Zeitschr. f. aegypt. Sprache*, xxxviii (1900), ap. Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 22; Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, IV, p. 284.
10. Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
11. *Nat. Hist.*, xiii, 13.
12. On *charta Fanniana*, see Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xii, 11, 21.
13. *Nat. Hist.*, xiii, 12.
14. Pliny, *Epp.*, viii, 15.
15. Ovid, *Tristia*, I, i, 9; III, i, 13.
16. Cicero *Ad Quint. Fr.*, II, xv, 21; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xiii, 12.
17. xiv, 209. "Let the rind of the Mareotic rush be smoothed by the seashell: then will the reed-pen run on an unimpeded path."
18. *Digest.*, XXXII, lii, 5, *libri perscripti, nondum malleati*.
19. Cicero, *Att.*, iv, 4.
20. Cf. Kenyon, *Palaeography of Greek Papyri*, 17 f.
21. III, i, 1 and 5.
22. Martial, II, vi, 3.
23. Justinian, *Novellae*, xlv, 2.
24. Cf. Kenyon, *op. cit.*, p. 18 f.

Rome Revisited

Parve, nec invideo, sine me, liber, ibis in Urbem

So Ovid, in exile, began his *Tristia*; with the note of pride in *the City*, for he was a Roman; with the tenderness of human appeal, for he was a poet. It was bitter not to be in Rome, bitterer still to think of being forgotten there:

Si quis, qui, quid, agam, forte requirat, erit.

But his *Tristia*, at least, his little child of exile, would make the journey. Of that he could be sure.

I tamen, i, pro me tu, cui licet, adspice Romam.

Nothing in all Ovid is so likeable and understandable, so Horatian, as the story his little voyager tells of this visit to the City of the Caesars. How timidly he introduces himself!

Missus in hanc venio timidi liber exulis urbem.

And with what delightful pleasantries he excuses his limping gait and shaggy, homespun aspect!

Clauda quod alterno subsidunt carmina versu,
Vel pedis hoc ratio, vel via longa facit.
Quod neque sum cedro flavus, nec pumice laevis,
Erubui domino cultior esse meo.

Small wonder that, as he himself tells us, one of the old Romans took pity on the little barbarian and showed him all the beautiful things he wished to visit. But did either of them, white-togaed Roman or humble provincial, dream that one day, when Aetium would have faded into history, the chance words of their conversation would be the surest memorial of the glory of the Palatine and of the palace of the Caesars? Probably not. Yet so it is, and so it happens that even today, when one wishes to visit the Palatine, one will look in vain for a likelier companion than this little stranger from Tomi, who is at once very eager to recount his visit, and very polite and willing to listen.

Haec sunt fora Caesaris. This, my *Tristia*, is what is left of that gorgeous Forum of Augustus to which you first turned your pilgrim steps! Surely, it was vastly different then, when each great base was fulfilled in a towering column and all those broken bits were a splendid frieze. Perhaps, too, that huge wall was already there to protect this beauty spot from the fires of the *Suburra*. And were those mosaics really the pavement? Broken and pieced together now, the marbles are still so beautiful that one can scarcely believe that they were meant to be walked upon, even by the sandals of the *gens togata*.

But we are loitering, and it is yet a little way ere we reach the Palatine.

Haec est a Sacris quae via nomen habet.

No doubt you descended here by the Capitoline, where the sacred bands were wont to make their way up to the temple of Jove. How natural, then, that you stopped a while, my *Tristia*, and meditated on the sacred rites, here at the Temple of Vesta, a place so rich in reminiscences of all that Rome held holy.

Hic locus est Vestae, qui Pallada servat et ignem;
Hic fuit antiqui regia parva Numae.

Even now, as you can see, the tiny bit of Vesta's temple that is here restored, is one of the most enchanting ruins in all Rome. There are, to be sure, only a few columns with their circling architrave, while only about a third of the whole is in the original marble. But see how utterly plain are the parts restored, and how the patches of the real temple stand out in all their delicate beauty. It is a fine piece of work, this restoration, my *Tristia*.

One almost seems to visualize this little gem of a temple even as it must have appeared to you that day of your first visit. Just across the way stand the three lone pillars that still guard in majestic grandeur what was once the temple of that mighty pair, *Fratres Helenae, lucida sidera*. But here is a simpler beauty and a calmer, the beauty of quiet, the beauty of the hearth. Here are tiny columns that invite, and a tiny frieze bright with vases, and palm leaves, and the things of peace, like a joyful procession in Attica, in the days when Greece was young.

But now the Palatine, my *Tristia*, where Romulus lived and eternal Rome began. Up, up, we mount past these great remains where Tiberius built, and mad Caligula, and Domitian, and one knows not who. There was a time, as you remember, when these mighty ruins were not here, and only the palace of Augustus shone in splendor on the summit. How you trembled as you approached the place exclaiming,

Me miserum! vereorque locum, vereorque potentem,
Et quatitur trepido littera nostra metu.
Adspicis exsangui chartam pallere colore?
Adspicis alternos intremuisse pedes?

But today you need not fear. No one will hinder your approach. No harsh librarian will bid you begone, as on that other day. There will be no *querna corona*, no *laurus*, no *candida templa dei*. On this spot stood the palace, now almost untraceable in its very ruins. This you thought the mightiest of all Rome's wonders, and of it there is hardly left a stone upon a stone! It is only by favor of fortune that the site itself has not been swallowed up in the giant house of the Flavii. But that, at least, has been spared, so that we can still stand here on the Palatine and picture against the sky of Rome the wondrous palace and temple of Augustus, the place that Horace knew so well, the place where Vergil sang of young Marcellus. Yet even as we watch, its white, shining columns fade into the gathering dusk, and it is gone. See, there is the guard to order us away. Perhaps, after all, it does remind you a bit of that other time,—

custos e sedibus illis
Praepositus, sancto iussit abire loco.

And somehow, too, we remember, as we turn and descend, that Rome did live to see a day that you, my *Tristia*, would not have dreamt of, the day foretold by Scipio as he watched the ruins of Carthage,

ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὁλόκληρ' Ἴλιος ἰρή,
καὶ Πριάμος καὶ λαὸς ἑυμμελίω Πριάμοιο.

Rome, Italy

WM. P. HETHERINGTON, S. J.

One comes away from the best translation, thankful that he can read the original if only after a fashion.—
Gildersleeve

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September by
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS

3441 North Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Subscription price: One Dollar a Year.

Entered as second class matter December 14, 1927, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITOR

James A. Kleist, S. J.

St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Francis A. Preuss, S. J., St. Stanislaus Seminary, Florissant, Mo.

Joseph A. Walsh, S. J., Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio

Julian L. Maline, S. J., Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio

BUSINESS EDITOR

Aloysius A. Jacobsmeyer, S. J., 3441 North Ashland Avenue
Chicago, Illinois
and Florissant, Mo.

All business communications (subscriptions, etc.), should be sent to the Business Editor, 3441 No. Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill., or Florissant, Mo.

OFFICERS OF THE MISSOURI PROVINCE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

President.....Francis G. Deglman, S. J.
Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska

Secretary.....William R. Hennes, S. J.
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Vol. VII

MARCH, 1931

No. 6

Editorial

To be a good teacher of the classics in high school or college is, apart from the possession of the indispensable pedagogical instinct, primarily a question of knowing the Latin and Greek languages; i. e. knowing them as mediums of expression, of literature. This knowledge can be gained only by a careful, intensive study of the *great* authors, for it is these that represent the high achievement in literature which makes it worth while even to-day to study Latin and Greek. The capacity of reading and enjoying Homer alone would repay years of hard toil, to say nothing of other imposing literary figures, such as Plato, Sophocles, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Vergil, Horace, Lucretius, Catullus, Tacitus, and others. But a semester course in these great masters will scarcely even tap the vein of pure gold which they hide. Not so lightly does the earth yield up her precious ore. The ideal teacher of the classics needs *deep* knowledge of the great classical writers, deep knowledge which is at once deep appreciation. Only when by lingering and meditative communion with the greatest spirits of Greece and Rome he has come to taste and relish the distilled essence of their beauty and power, may he allow himself to wander away from the great stars to the lesser lights. Senecas and Plinys, Lucans and Ovids, even Ciceros and Caesars we have in our own modern literatures—and greater than these: but only Greece possesses a Homer or a Plato, only Rome a Vergil or a Horace. When we have culled the fairest flowers in the garden of Hellas and Hesperia, and have learned to savor their most elusive aromas and to discern with

understanding joy their softest tints, then and only then will a more confined attention to philology, to a particular period or writer or work of classical literature, be wise or fruitful. Nor let the busy teacher of the classics be ashamed to confess that he is not keeping abreast of all the current literature of his subject. To do this is possible and profitable only for the advanced specialist. If the average high-school and college teacher knows and uses a few of the best books, old as well as new, that treat of the classical languages and literatures, books of literary interpretation rather than technical works, he is doing all that can be humanly expected of him; he is doing all, too, that is essential to good teaching of the classics as liberalizing subjects at the secondary or college level.

A book for those who love and teach the classics as literature, is the modest little volume of Professor Homer F. Rebert, *Virgil and Those Others*, published by the "Virgil Bimillennium Committee" of Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts. It is a collection of eight charming essays, a few of which had appeared previously in various classical journals. The spirit of these sprightly little appreciations of Vergil, Catullus, Horace, and Juvenal can be inferred from the following lines of the preface: "This volume is devoted to the thesis that the Latin classics must be looked upon as literature, as a form of artistic expression, if the full educational and cultural values are to be realized from their pursuit. . . . It comes as a surprise to the student in college to learn that Latin has in store for the lover of literature the same sort of pleasure and profit that is commonly found in Browning, Shelley, and Keats. But the student will not have this pleasant surprise, if the instructor is not a lover of literature." We heartily congratulate Professor Rebert on this his latest contribution to the good cause.

Antigone

Holy heathen, daughter of God before God was known (i. e. known in Greece), flower from Paradise after Paradise was closed, that, quitting all things for which flesh languishes, safety and honor, a palace and a home, didst make thyself a houseless pariah, lest the poor pariah king, thy outcast father, should want a hand to lead him in his darkness, or a voice to whisper comfort in his misery; angel, that badest depart forever the glories of thy own bridal day, lest he that had shared thy nursery in childhood should want the honors of a funeral; idolatrous yet Christian lady, that in the spirit of martyrdom trodst alone the yawning billows of the grave, flying from earthly hopes, lest everlasting despair should settle upon the grave of thy brother.—(DeQuincey, *The Antigone of Sophocles*)

The world of scholarship is large enough to maintain every type of specialist. But the student of humane letters must be on his guard against the specialist's distorted perspective.—Paul Shorey

Book Review

Bulletin on First Year Latin, edited by Victor D. Hill, Dorothy M. Seeger, and Bertha M. Winch. Published by the Ohio Latin Service Committee, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. 1930. Pp. xvi and 256. \$1.20 (post-paid).

The nature and the value of this book are not to be judged either by the title or the price. It is much more than a bulletin for teachers of First Year Latin. It is a vade-mecum which should be on the desk of every teacher of High School Latin, and even the college teacher will find in it much that is useful. The book covers practically every problem that can confront the Latin teacher, from a preliminary presentation of objectives to collateral reading and the organization of Latin clubs. In a very intelligent and practical way, it gives suggestions on the teaching of vocabulary, etymology, English derivatives, syntax, reading, translation, and prose composition. It expounds principles of classroom procedure, of effective assignments, of the building and correcting of tests and examinations. It abounds with suggestions on the use of games, pictures, maps, and other devices, and each section is supplemented by a very orderly and comprehensive bibliography, together with information as to the sources whence maps, coins, slides, materials for modelling, standardized tests, etc., may be obtained. The exact or approximate price of such materials is always given. An index and the fine typographical make-up of the book facilitate its use as a reference work, while the succinctness of treatment will encourage the teacher to make use of the book at odd moments for the thoughtful perusal of whatever topic catches his fancy. Such reading will serve as a constant incentive and guide to the youthful teacher, and as a fruitful examination of conscience for the more experienced.

The book is the work of a select group of experienced teachers, who are undoubtedly actuated by a deep love and enthusiasm for their work, and who thoroughly understand the problems that confront the teacher of Latin. The editors labor under no delusion as to the difficulties that are to be overcome in the teaching of Latin, or as to the amount of success that may be expected of the average pupil. There is no unchecked idealism, no thought that clever methods will supplant hard work. At the same time principles of efficiency are kept steadily in view. It is refreshing to find a group of teachers who are ready to face courageously and to meet sympathetically and constructively such problems as the following: The average pupil entering high school does not know what is meant by accent or the accent mark, he does not know the meaning of many ordinary English words, he ceases to study vocabulary as soon as the teacher ceases to insist on it daily; he does not know the difference between the active and the passive voice, he fails to recognize English derivatives when there is little or no difference in spelling between the Latin and the English word, etc. If the novice teacher learns to meet this situation in the spirit which is inculcated in this book, he or she will escape many a dark

hour of discouragement during the first year of classroom experience.

The editors do not pretend to set forth a single approach to the teaching of Latin. They realize that a method which will succeed in the hands of one teacher will fail with another. Hence there is plenty of variety, but through the variety there runs a well-defined main stream of sound pedagogy. While there are many valuable, and a few not so valuable, suggestions for ancillary activities, both inside and outside of the class-room, the editors repeatedly emphasize the fact that the main goal is the teaching of Latin as a language.

Detroit, Mich.

HUGH P. O'NEILL, S. J.

The Evolution of French

In ancient Rome, as is well known, the common people did not express their thoughts in the highly correct and polished sentences of Cicero or Caesar. Side by side with the classical language, which owed much of its refinement to Greek influence, there flourished another species of Latin, which more truly portrayed the genius of the Roman mind. This language of the people not only allowed itself greater freedom in matters of grammar than did its educated sister, but its vocabulary also contained many expressions which would not have sounded quite proper in forensic address or in the halls of Augustus. This was the real language of Rome, but its development along its own wayward lines was hampered by the chaperon-like vigilance of its classical sister.

Popular Latin or *lingua rustica*, as it was frequently called to distinguish it from classical Latin, was the language not only of Rome and of Italy, but of the outlying colonies as well. It followed the Roman eagles to the uttermost bounds of the empire. In fact the victory of the Roman language was more complete than was that of the Roman sword and fasces. It was not the policy of Rome to disrupt any more than was necessary, the religious, civil, and economic institutions of the peoples whom she conquered, yet her language did not manifest the same tolerant spirit. It is not too much to say that with two or three exceptions, the Latin language gradually replaced every native tongue with which it came into contact for a sufficient length of time. The one notable exception was Greek.

Hence when we say that the Romance languages are descended from Latin, we mean that statement in the fullest sense. We do not mean it in the sense that Latin was fused with native dialects in Spain, Italy, and France, for the native dialects were completely swept out of existence. They left behind only an infinitesimally small part of their vocabulary, which like pathetic grave stones scattered here and there, preserve to us the memory of a battle that was fought and lost. Even these words seem to owe their continued existence to the fact that Latin had no corresponding words with which to replace them. Hence we may say that Italian, French, and Spanish are not merely the offspring of Latin—they are Latin, the modern form into which popular Latin has developed. This development was

conditioned chiefly by the intrinsic genius of the language, and partly by the environment into which it was thrown. This environment includes racial, social, and climatic factors. It does not include the language previously spoken, except in so far as previous habits of pronunciation were carried over into Latin. This seems to be most rigorously true of the development of Latin in Gaul. In this latter instance, however, we must add a new factor to the environment, i. e. the influence of the Teutonic invasions, which contributed several thousand words to the developing vocabulary of French. Many of these words have persisted to the present day.

Though Latin was first introduced into Gaul in the second century B. C., it was not until the time of Julius Caesar that it became the official language of the country as a whole. The military conquest of the Gallic tribes was speedily followed by their social transformation. They were quick to realize the superiority of Roman civilization, and as one author puts it, "they became Romanized with enthusiastic haste." Gaul was soon flooded with Roman merchants, colonists, and retired soldiers. The Gauls themselves not only aspired to Roman citizenship, but they also ambitioned places in the Roman army and civil service, and for this a knowledge of Latin was an important, if not an absolutely necessary, qualification.

During the first two or three centuries, there was close contact between Rome and her provinces, and consequently the Latin language, except for certain local peculiarities in pronunciation, preserved an almost complete homogeneity throughout the empire. However, when the barbarian invasions of the fifth century effected the downfall of Rome's political and social institutions, they dealt a death blow to her official language as well. Thenceforth the *Lingua Romana* in the now separated provinces was free to wander at its own sweet will, and it set about the task of self-realization with a vengeance. Local environment, which had hitherto meant so little, now assumed a dominant position, and the process of what we may call centrifugal evolution went forward with headlong rapidity. The process was encouraged still more by the absence of literary activity, which otherwise would have exerted a stabilizing influence. During the centuries of war and disorder which followed the migration of nations, there was little time for the gentle art of writing. Except for a few lucky manuscripts, which found asylum in the monasteries, the literature of imperial Rome had perished from the earth, and men were too much engrossed in more pressing business to think of trying to recover the literature of the past or to lay the foundation for a literature of the future. They were more interested in what they had to say than in how correctly they were to say it. There was, it is true, a species of written Latin, which made a faint effort to recall classical traditions, but for a long time it could not emancipate itself from the influence of the spoken language, and it was saved from utter barbarism only by the fact that it was called into the service of the Church. Bishops and priests preached and wrote in the language of the

people, and their elevating influence could not but make itself felt. Classical traditions as well as classical manuscripts were preserved in the monasteries. Henry Bradley, editor of the Oxford Dictionary, says on this point, "The best monastic Latin differs greatly from the language of ancient Rome, but as an instrument of literary expression it is not much inferior to Classical Latin." In the revival of learning that dawned with the reign of Charlemagne, this mustard seed of culture began to sprout, and ere long it bloomed into the full glory of Medieval Latin, the language of literary and scientific Europe.

After the downfall of Roman supremacy, the Latin of Gaul developed into what is known as Gallo-Romanic, but it would be a mistake to think that it long remained a unified form of speech. Each separate locality began to introduce its own peculiarities, and in a short time the multiplicity of dialects and *patois* rivalled the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel. However, certain of these dialects, by reason of intrinsic merit, or more often by reason of the importance of the district in which they flourished, gradually assumed a position of prominence, and some of them even began to merit the dignity of being considered independent languages. Roughly, however, we may group this multitude of dialects into two great divisions, that of the *Langue d'Oc* in Southern France, and that of the *Langue d'Oïl* in the North. The most noteworthy members of the *Langue d'Oc* family were Gaseon, Limousin, Languedocian, Dauphinois, Savoyard and Provençal, the last of which has survived to the present day. In the *Langue d'Oïl* group we have four principal branches, Picard, Norman, Burgundian and the dialect of the Île-de-France, or French properly so-called. These for a time were independent dialects, but the rise of the Capet dynasty gave to the dialect of the Île-de-France, i. e., Parisian French, a pre-eminence which it was destined never to lose. In a march of progress which extended over several centuries, this dialect spread over the whole of France and became the language of the nation. However, its universal sway is somewhat limited by Provençal in the south of France, by the Celtic dialect of Brittany, and by minor dialectical peculiarities throughout the country.

The first introduction of French words into English took place in the reign of Edward the Confessor, whose French sympathies were warmly resented by his Anglo-Saxon underlords. This first infiltration of French was but the trickling of a tiny stream of water through the dike, as compared with the inundation that followed the opening of the flood-gates by the Norman conquest. The Normans were a people of Danish descent who had settled in France toward the end of the ninth century. During the one hundred and fifty years that preceded the Conquest, they had exchanged their own language for French. This adopted tongue they took with them to England, where it at once swept English from the court, the army, and the upper classes of society. By reason of its isolation from the parent stem on the continent, it developed along independent lines, and in a

few years it grew so unlike any other dialect of French that it merited a name of its own. It was called Anglo-Norman or Anglo-French. The common people however, were determined to remain faithful to their mother tongue, and so for about three hundred years, Anglo-French kept up a losing fight with Anglo-Saxon, until by 1400 it had ceased to be a living language. Two reasons may be assigned for its demise; first, the Normans who were originally Danes, were more closely allied to the Anglo-Saxon race than they were to the French, and secondly, Anglo-Saxon had freely borrowed and naturalized thousands of the most useful Norman words. Thus drained of its life-blood, there was nothing left of Anglo-French but the dry carcass of grammatical structure which was easily sloughed off.

English had nothing more to gain from Anglo-French, but it soon struck up a speaking acquaintance with continental French, chiefly through such literary men as Chaucer, Lydgate and Caxton. By this time the dialect of the Île-de-France had assumed the supremacy, and from the fifteenth century to the present day, our English borrowings have come from this source.

In undertaking to trace English words to their French origin, it is important to remember that we have borrowed words from two distinct dialects. Thus for instance the Latin word *captare* (later changed to *captiare*) became *catcher* in Norman French and gives us our English word "to catch." In the dialect of the Île-de-France it became *chassier*, which gives us the English word "to chase." We must also remember that this borrowing process has been going on for eight hundred years, and that during that period, the French language itself has been undergoing an unceasing change. An instance of this is to be found in the two words "corpse" and "corps." Both represent the same French word, but while the former preserves the sound it had in the Middle Ages, the latter follows the modern pronunciation.

Detroit, Mich.

HUGH P. O'NEILL, S. J.

Teachers of Vergil may be interested in a little four-page leaflet, entitled *Aids for the Rhythmic Reading of Vergil*, which is being used in many schools with good results. It contains in simple form rules for the hexameter, general rules of prosody, rules for final syllables, and for the increments of verbs and nouns, and a few special rules. The leaflet can be procured in quantities from the compiler, the Rev. Otto J. Kuhnmuensch, S. J., of St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

The love of letters and the value of reading are not confined to one's schooldays, but end only with life.—*Quintilian*.

In dealing with poetry, as with the kindred arts, criticism almost necessarily ceases to be fruitful or definite at the very point where the interest of the problems becomes the greatest.—*F. W. H. Myers*

The Shield of Achilles

If ever the grandest bard of them all took holiday beneath a plane tree or an elm (whispering secrets to it), it was on the day on which he wrought the glories of his hero's shield. That day he revelled in lovely language, forgot wounds and spears and genealogies, and betook himself to sheer poetry. He hid nothing of his unparalleled knowledge of human nature. He was artistic—the perfect workman—the singer whose least sighing or laughing phrase is a triumph of art.

There is a chorus in the *Alcestis*, where Apollo is sent over Admetus' hills—*βοσκήμασι σοῖσι σοφίζων*—a pastoral of lucid delicacy; and then there is Sophocles' "You have come even to our white Colonus": it is like these choruses that the shield is. There is tragedy on it, but it is somehow only the echo of tragedy; it is not like Hecuba's lament, or like Priam rolling in the filth, a real song of tragedy. The language is a proof of this: it is always calm. The rhythm is as steady and as even as rhythm in Homer can be. The modulations in the hexameters are always interpretative of the thought, always responsive to the poet's soul; even as the bow of the violinist is to the least shade of emotion in the soul of him that wields it. But there is no triple *forte*, no *marcato*. Another detail of the language is that one of the *ἄταξ ἐλεγμένα* which calls forth erudition from the scholars, is the word for the particular kind of pipe with which that never-to-be-forgotten neatherd beguiled his flocks, himself innocent of guile and occupied with his last melody, as he led them to the water. One place where the special charm of the quiet and ease and grace of the language shows itself so indefinitely as to defy and elude all version, interpretation, or explanation, is in the six lines describing the firmament.

Then the sheer poetry of it: talking about things which are simple and beautiful; doing it with largeness, which in Homer is never separated from art; choosing the things for their simplicity and beauty, and enhancing these qualities! Such are the boy who played the clear-toned viol and sang the Linus song; the boys and girls who danced in the dancing ground, such as Daedalus built in Cnossus for "fair-tressed Ariadne" (a greater than Daedalus is here!); Strife and Turmoil stalking among the troops; and the field that "grew dark behind"—it is all in very truth of purest gold!

Deeply human too is that shield. The plowmen who strained forward to reach the furrow's end; the happy children who bore the grapes in baskets; the relatives who would take no blood-money; the busy dames sprinkling meal on the roast beneath the trees; the folk who in distress clung to their city as well as they could—all are our very own.

The last thing to notice is the supreme art, in the whole and in the details. In the centre, above all things, the sun, and the Bear, "whom men also call the Wain"; and around all the power of Ocean—the border of that which is the subject of the shield, the Homeric world!

Florissant, Mo.

CHARLES J. O'NEIL, S. J.

Some Observations on the Sapphic and Alcaic Stanzas and on the Elegiac Distich

The following observations may perhaps be of use to some readers of the BULLETIN both in reading Horace and in writing original Latin verse.

The *Sapphic* stanza consists of four lines, of which the three first are alike. The fourth is an Adonic.

1-3: — u | — — | — || u u | — u | — u

4: — u u | — u

To preserve the rhythm of the Sapphic, the verse caesura generally falls after the fifth syllable; occasionally it comes after the sixth, but this is rare and perhaps less elegant.

A line must not begin with two dissyllables, i. e., words and feet may not coincide; there must be a caesura.

In order to give variety to the cadences in the stanza, a line should be constructed of words that are not of the same length as the corresponding words in the other lines. This rule is not universal. The composer of Latin verse should be guided in his judgment by careful observation of the practice of Horace.

The Adonic should not begin a sentence to be continued in the next stanza.

Et and *in* often suffer elision at the end of the line.

The *Alcaic* stanza consists of four lines, of which there are three varieties, the first two being alike.

1-2: u | — u | — — | — u u | — u | u

3: u | — u | — — | — u | — u

4: — u u | — u u | — u | — u

In lines 1 and 2 the first syllable may be long or short, though commonly it is long. The fifth syllable is always long in Latin. The verse caesura is after the fifth syllable. In compound words, it may fall after the preposition. The sixth syllable is at times elided.

In the third line, the third foot is a spondee in Latin, a trochee in Greek. On the rhythm and construction of this line the musical cadence of the Alcaic depends. The rhythm will generally be good if the fifth syllable is accented. The line is most perfect when it consists of three trisyllabic words, as *permisit expertus fidelem*. It must not begin with two dissyllables, nor a quadrisyllable, nor a mono- and a tri-syllable. This rule does not apply when there is an elision, as in *nec cogere humanos in usus*.

A quadrisyllable or a trisyllable with *que* is seldom allowed at the end of the line. Although monosyllables at the end of the line are avoided, *et* and *in* often conclude the line after an elision.

A dissyllabic word at the end of the line is rare.

The third line should have a caesura after the third or the sixth syllable, or after both; as *finire quaerentem labores*.

The most perfect types of the fourth line are the following:

*Pierio recreatis antro, and
Fulmine sustulerit caduco.*

The fourth line sometimes ends with a word of four or even six syllables. In the *Alcaic*, as in the *Sapphic* stanza, variety is the key to beauty and harmony, both in line and stanza. Much will depend on the manner in which the length of the various clauses is managed. It is not desirable to limit the expression of an idea to the compass of a stanza; but it is advisable not to extend a thought beyond three stanzas.

The following general rules should also be attended to: a short vowel at the end of a word is never placed before initial *sp*, *sc* or *st*; the close form in *i* is used, not *ii*; final *o* should not be short; final *ium* in nouns sometimes reads *yum*, that is, the *i* is consonantal, not vocalic; the pronoun *is* must be avoided in lyric poetry, both as a noun and as an adjective.

The *Elegiac Distich* consists of a regular hexameter followed by a pentameter. The rules for the structure of the hexameter need no explanation. A pentameter consists of two dactyls or spondees and a long caesural syllable followed by two dactyls and another long (or short) syllable which with the preceding long syllable constitutes the fifth foot.

*Principiis obsta, sero medicina paratur
quum mala per longas invaluere moras.*

*Est avis in silva nigro vestita colore;
si cor sustuleris, res erit alba nimis (=cor-nix).*

The schema is as follows:

Hexam.: — uu | — uu | — || uu | — uu | — uu | — u
Pentam.: — uu | — uu | — || — uu | — uu | — u

At the beginning of the pentameter, a dactyl followed by a spondee is preferable to a spondee followed by a dactyl.

Neither hemistich should end with a monosyllable. If now and then a monosyllable is used at the end of the first hemistich, it should be preceded either by another long monosyllable, or by a word of two short syllables, as in:

*Idem ego sum, qui nunc an vivam, perfide, nescis,
cura tibi de quo quaerere nulla fuit (Ovid).*

Elisions should be avoided in the pentameter, especially in the second hemistich, and they must never occur in the last dactyl except in the case of *est*, when it ends the verse and is preceded by a dissyllable, as in:

Nam nisi iusta tua est, iusta querela mea est.

O. J. K.

